

REMARKS

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. Namely, a step of "having said at least one application at said user mode level determine a sequence to be followed for a set of asynchronous command" has been added. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed, such as in steps 20, 30, and 40 of figures 4, 5, and 6 respectively. No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has not addressed the arguments provided in the previously filed response with regards to the objection of claims 10, 14, and 13 for being substantial duplicates of previous claims. It is unclear to the Applicant whether these arguments were considered by the Examiner and whether they were found to be persuasive or not. The Examiner is asked to comment on this specific issue.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Dingwall et al. (US 5,903,752). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The Examiner has indicated that the step of "providing from said at least one application a sequence of asynchronous commands", as recited in claim 1, reads on the software interrupts generated by a WindowsTM Application wishing to communicate with Application-Specific Tasks, as described by Dingwall in column 4, lines 14-16. The Applicant respectfully submits that even if the software interrupts provide a sequence of asynchronous commands, which the Applicant does not admit to herein, Dingwall fails to teach a step of "having said

at least one application at said user mode level determine a sequence to be followed for a set of asynchronous commands".

In the case of Dingwall, where a software interrupt wishes to communicate with an Application-Specific Task pre-created in the VxD during computer system initialization, the sequence of commands is predefined or pre-existing in the VxD. There is no need to determine what the sequence should be and therefore, no teachings or suggestions of a step for determining at a user mode level the sequence of the commands to be executed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-14 as amended do not read on the prior art as cited and requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-14 is respectfully requested. It is believed that Claims 1-14 are allowable over the prior art and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Michel Doyon et al.

By:
/ALEXANDRA DAOUD/

Alexandra Daoud

Registration No 55,992
Customer Number: 020988